arXiv:math/0112274v1 [math.FA] 25 Dec 2001

A PROPERTY OF STRICTLY SINGULAR 1-1 OPERATORS

GEORGE ANDROULAKIS, PER ENFLO

Abstract We prove that if T is a strictly singular 1-1 operator defined on an infinite dimensional Banach space X, then for every infinite dimensional subspace Y of X there exists an infinite dimensional subspace Z of Y such that Z contains orbits of T of every finite length and the restriction of T on Z is a compact operator.

1. Introduction

An operator on an infinite dimensional Banach space is called *strictly singular* if it fails to be an isomorphism when it is restricted to any infinite dimensional subspace (by "operator" we will always mean a "continuous linear map"). It is easy to see that an operator T on an infinite dimensional Banach space X is strictly singular if and only if for every infinite dimensional subspace Y of X there exists an infinite dimensional subspace Z of Y such that the restriction of T on Z, $T|_Z : Z \to X$, is a compact operator. Moreover, Z can be assumed to have a basis. Compact operators are special examples of strictly singular operators. If $1 \leq p < q \leq \infty$ then the inclusion map $i_{p,q} : \ell_p \to \ell_q$ is a strictly singular (non-compact) operator. A *Hereditarily Indecomposable* (H.I.) Banach space is an infinite dimensional space such that no subspace can be written as a topological sum of two infinite dimensional subspaces. W.T. Gowers and B. Maurey constructed the first example of an H.I. space [8]. It is also proved in [8] that every operator on a complex H.I. space can be written as a strictly singular perturbation of a multiple of the identity. If X is a complex H.I. space and T is a strictly singular operator on X then the spectrum of T resembles the spectrum of a compact operator on a complex Banach space: it is either the singleton $\{0\}$ (i.e. T is quasi-nilpotent), or a sequence $\{\lambda_n : n = 1, 2, \dots\} \cup \{0\}$ where λ_n is an eigenvalue of T with finite multiplicity for all n, and $(\lambda_n)_n$ converges to 0, if it is an infinite sequence. It was asked whether there exists an H.I. space X which gives a positive solution to the "Identity plus Compact" problem, namely, every operator on X is a compact perturbation of a multiple of the identity. This question was answered in negative in [1] for the H.I. space constructed in [8], (for related results see [7], [9], and [2]). By [3], (or the more general beautiful theorem of V. Lomonosov [10]), if a Banach space gives a positive solution to the "Identity plus Compact" problem, it also gives a positive solution to the famous Invariant Subspace Problem (I.S.P.). The I.S.P. asks whether there exists a separable infinite dimensional Banach space on which every operator has a non-trivial invariant subspace, (by "non-trivial" we mean "different than $\{0\}$ and the whole space"). It remains unknown whether ℓ_2 is a positive solution to the I.S.P.. Several negative solutions to the I.S.P. are known [4], [5], [11], [12], [13]. In particular, there exists a strictly singular operator with no non-trivial invariant subspace [14]. It is unknown whether every strictly singular operator on a super-reflexive Banach space has a non-trivial invariant subspace. Our main result

---

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 47B07,46B03.

The research was partially supported by NSF.

(Theorem 2.1) states that if T is a strictly singular 1-1 operator on an infinite dimensional Banach space X, then for every infinite dimensional Banach space Y of X there exists an infinite dimensional Banach space Z of Y such that the restriction of T on Z, $T|_Z : Z \to X$, is compact, and Z contains orbits of T of every finite length (i.e. for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $z_n \in Z$ such that $\{z_n, Tz_n, T^2 z_n, \dots, T^n z_n\} \subset Z$). We raise the following

Question. *Let T be a quasi-nilpotent operator on a super-reflexive Banach space X, such that for every infinite dimensional subspace Y of X there exists an infinite dimensional subspace Z of Y such that $T|_Z : Z \to X$ is compact and Z contains orbits of T of every finite length. Does T have a non-trivial invariant subspace?*

By our main result, an affirmative answer to the above question would give that every strictly singular, 1-1, quasi-nilpotent operator on a super-reflexive Banach space has a non-trivial invariant subspace; in particular, we would obtain that every operator on the super-reflexive H.I. space constructed by V. Ferenczi [6] has a non-trivial invariant subspace, and thus the I.S.P. would be answered in affirmative.

2. The main result

Our main result is

Theorem 2.1. *Let T be a strictly singular 1-1 operator on an infinite dimensional Banach space X. Then, for every infinite dimensional subspace Y of X there exists an infinite dimensional subspace Z of Y, such that Z contains orbits of T of every finite length, and the restriction of T on Z, $T|_Z : Z \to X$, is a compact operator.*

The proof of Theorem 2.1 is based on Theorem 2.3. We first need to define the basis constant of a finite set of normalized vectors of a Banach space in an analogous way of the definition of the basis constant of an infinite sequence.

Definition 2.2. *Let X be a Banach space, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n$ be normalized elements of X. We define the basis constant of $x_1, \dots, x_n$ to be*

$$\mathrm{bc}\{x_1, \dots, x_n\} := \sup \left\{ |\alpha_1|, \dots, |\alpha_n| : \quad \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_i x_i \right\| = 1 \right\}.$$

Notice that

$$\mathrm{bc}\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}^{-1} = \inf \left\{ \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{n} \beta_i x_i \right\| : \quad \max_{1 \le i \le n} |\beta_i| = 1 \right\},$$

and that $\mathrm{bc}\{x_1, \dots, x_n\} < \infty$ if and only if $x_1, \dots, x_n$ are linearly independent.

Before stating Theorem 2.3 recall that if T is a quasi-nilpotent operator on a Banach space X, then for every $x \in X$ and $\eta > 0$ there exists an increasing sequence $(i_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ in $\mathbb{N}$ such that $\|T^{i_n} x\| \le \eta \|T^{i_n - 1} x\|$. Theorem 2.3 asserts that if T is a strictly singular 1-1 operator on a Banach space X then for arbitrarily small $\eta > 0$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $x \in X$, $\|x\| = 1$, such that $\|T^i x\| \le \eta \|T^{i-1} x\|$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, k+1$, and moreover, the basis constant of $x, Tx/\|Tx\|, \dots, T^k x/\|T^k x\|$ does not exceed $1/\sqrt{\eta}$.

Theorem 2.3. *Let T be a strictly singular 1-1 operator on a Banach space X. Let Y be an infinite dimensional subspace of X, F be a finite codimensional subspace of X and $k \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Then there exists $\eta_0 \in (0,1)$ *such that for every* $0 < \eta \leq \eta_0$ *there exists* $x \in Y$, $\|x\| = 1$ *satisfying*

(a) $T^{i-1}x \in F$ *and* $\|T^i x\| \leq \eta \|T^{i-1}x\|$ *for* $i = 1, 2, \dots, k+1$, *and*

(b) $\operatorname{bc}\left\{x, \frac{Tx}{\|Tx\|}, \dots, \frac{T^k x}{\|T^k x\|}\right\} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\eta}}$,

(where T^0 *denotes the identity operator on* X*).*

We postpone the proof of Theorem 2.3.

Proof of Theorem 2.1. Let T be a strictly singular 1-1 operator on an infinite dimensional Banach space X, and Y be an infinite dimensional subspace of X. Inductively for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we construct a normalized sequence $(z_n)_n \subset Y$, an increasing sequence of finite families $(z_j^*)_{j \in J_n}$ of normalized functionals on X (i.e. $(J_n)_n$ is an increasing sequence of finite index sets), and a sequence $(\eta_n)_n \subset (0,1)$, as follows:

For $n = 1$ apply Theorem 2.3 for $F = X$ (set $J_1 = \emptyset$), $k = 1$, to obtain $\eta_1 < 1/2^6$ and $z_1 \in Y$, $\|z_1\| = 1$ such that

$$\|T^i z_1\| < \eta_1 \|T^{i-1} z_1\| \text{ for } i = 1, 2, \tag{1}$$

and

$$\operatorname{bc}\{z_1, \frac{Tz_1}{\|Tz_1\|}\} < \frac{1}{\sqrt{\eta_1}}. \tag{2}$$

For the inductive step, assume that for $n \geq 2$, $(z_i)_{i=1}^{n-1} \subset Y$, $(z_j^*)_{j \in J_i}$ $(i = 1, \dots, n-1)$, and $(\eta_i)_{i=1}^{n-1}$ have been constructed. Let J_n be a finite index set with $J_{n-1} \subseteq J_n$ and $(x_j^*)_{j \in J_n}$ be a set of normalized functionals on X such that

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{for every } x \in \operatorname{span}\{T^i z_j : 1 \leq j \leq n-1, 0 \leq i \leq j\} \\ \text{there exists } j_0 \in J_n \text{ such that } |x_{j_0}^*(x)| \geq \|x\|/2. \end{array} \tag{3}$$

Apply Theorem 2.3 for $F = \cap_{j \in J_n} \ker(x_j^*)$, and $k = n$, to obtain $\eta_n < 1/(n^2 2^{2n+4})$ and $z_n \in Y$, $\|z_n\| = 1$ such that

$$T^{i-1} z_n \in F \text{ and } \|T^i z_n\| < \eta_n \|T^{i-1} z_n\| \text{ for } i = 1, 2, \dots, n+1, \tag{4}$$

and

$$\operatorname{bc}\{z_n, \frac{Tz_n}{\|Tz_n\|}, \dots, \frac{T^n z_n}{\|T^n z_n\|}\} < \frac{1}{\sqrt{\eta_n}}. \tag{5}$$

This finishes the induction.

Let $\widetilde{Z} = \operatorname{span}\{T^i z_n : n \in \mathbb{N}, 0 \leq i \leq n\}$, and for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $Z_n = \operatorname{span}\{T^i z_n : 0 \leq i \leq n\}$. Let $x \in \widetilde{Z}$ with $\|x\| = 1$ and write $x = \sum_{n=1}^\infty x_n$ where $x_n \in Z_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We claim that

$$\|Tx_n\| < \frac{1}{2^n} \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{6}$$

Indeed, write

$$x = \sum_{n=1}^\infty \sum_{i=0}^n a_{i,n} \frac{T^i z_n}{\|T^i z_n\|} \text{ and } x_n = \sum_{i=0}^n a_{i,n} \frac{T^i z_n}{\|T^i z_n\|} \text{ for } n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and set $\widetilde{x}_n = x_1 + x_2 + \cdots + x_n$. Let $j_0 \in J_{n+1}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}\|\widetilde{x}_n\| &\leq 2|x^*_{j_0}(\widetilde{x}_n)| \text{ (by (3) for } n-1 \text{ replaced by } n)\\ &= 2|x^*_{j_0}(x)| \text{ (since for } n+1 \leq m,\ J_{n+1} \subseteq J_m \text{ thus by (4), } x_m \in \ker(x^*_{j_0}))\\ &\leq 2\|x^*_{j_0}\|\|x\| = 2.\end{aligned}$$

Thus $\|x_n\| = \|\widetilde{x}_n - \widetilde{x}_{n-1}\| \leq \|\widetilde{x}_n\| + \|\widetilde{x}_{n-1}\| \leq 4$ (where $\widetilde{x}_0 = 0$). Hence, by (2) and (5) we obtain that

$$(7) \qquad |a_{i,n}| \leq 4\mathrm{bc}\{\frac{T^i z_n}{\|T^i z_n\|} : i = 0, \dots, n\} \leq \frac{4}{\sqrt{\eta_n}} \text{ for } i = 0, \dots, n.$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}\|Tx_n\| &= \|\sum_{i=0}^{n} a_{i,n} \frac{T^{i+1} z_n}{\|T^i z_n\|}\| \leq \sum_{i=0}^{n} |a_{i,n}| \frac{\|T^{i+1} z_n\|}{\|T^i z_n\|}\\ &\leq \sum_{i=0}^{n} \frac{4}{\sqrt{\eta_n}} \eta_n \text{ (by (1), (4), and (7))}\\ &= 4n\sqrt{\eta_n} < \frac{1}{2^n} \text{ (by the choice of } \eta_n),\end{aligned}$$

which finishes the proof of (6). Let Z to be the closure of $\widetilde{Z}$. We claim that $T|_Z : Z \to X$ is a compact operator, which will finish the proof of Theorem 2.1. Indeed, let $(y_m)_m \subset \widetilde{Z}$ where for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $\|y_m\| = 1$, and write $y_m = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} y_{m,n}$ where $y_{m,n} \in Z_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. It suffices to prove that $(Ty_m)_m$ has a Cauchy subsequence. Indeed, since Z_n is finite dimensional for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $(y^1_m)_m$ a subsequence of $(y_m)_m$ such that $(Ty^1_{m,1})_m$ is Cauchy. Let $(y^2_m)_m$ be a subsequence of $(y^1_m)_m$ such that $(Ty^2_{m,2})_m$ is Cauchy. Continue similarly, and let $\widetilde{y}_m = y^m_m$ and $\widetilde{y}_{m,n} = y^m_{m,n}$ for all $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then for $m \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $\widetilde{y}_m = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \widetilde{y}_{m,n}$ where $\widetilde{y}_{m,n} \in Z_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Also, for all $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ with $n \leq m$, $(\widetilde{y}_t)_{t \geq m}$ and $(\widetilde{y}_{t,n})_{t \geq m}$ are subsequences of $(y^m_t)_t$ and $(y^m_{t,n})_t$ respectively. Thus for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $(T\widetilde{y}_{t,n})_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a Cauchy sequence. We claim that $(T\widetilde{y}_m)_m$ is a Cauchy sequence. Indeed, for $\varepsilon > 0$ let $m_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $1/2^{m_0 - 1} < \varepsilon$ and let $m_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$(8) \qquad \|T\widetilde{y}_{s,n} - T\widetilde{y}_{t,n}\| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2m_0} \text{ for all } s, t \geq m_1 \text{ and } n = 1, 2, \dots m_0.$$

Thus for $s, t \geq m_1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|T\widetilde{y}_s - T\widetilde{y}_t\| &= \|\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} T\widetilde{y}_{s,n} - T\widetilde{y}_{t,n}\|\\ &\leq \sum_{n=1}^{m_0} \|T\widetilde{y}_{s,n} - T\widetilde{y}_{t,n}\| + \sum_{n=m_0+1}^{\infty} \|T\widetilde{y}_{s,n}\| + \sum_{n=m_0+1}^{\infty} \|T\widetilde{y}_{t,n}\|\\ &< m_0 \frac{\varepsilon}{2m_0} + 2 \sum_{n=m_0+1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^n} \text{ (by (6) and (8))}\\ &= \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + \frac{2}{2^{m_0}} < \varepsilon \text{ (by the choice of } m_0),\end{aligned}$$

which proves that $(T\widetilde{y}_m)_m$ is a Cauchy sequence and finishes the proof of Theorem 2.1. $\square$

For the proof of Theorem 2.3 we need the next two results.

Lemma 2.4. *Let T be a strictly singular 1-1 operator on an infinite dimensional Banach space X. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\eta > 0$. Then for every infinite dimensional subspace Y of X there exists an infinite dimensional subspace Z of Y such that for all $z \in Z$ and for all $i = 1, \dots, k$ we have that*

$$\|T^i z\| \leq \eta \|T^{i-1} z\|$$

(where T^0 denotes the identity operator on X).

Proof. Let T be a strictly singular 1-1 operator on an infinite dimensional Banach space X, $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\eta > 0$. We first prove the following

Claim: For every infinite dimensional linear submanifold (not necessarily closed) W of X there exists an infinite dimensional linear submanifold Z of W such that $\|Tz\| \leq \eta\|z\|$ for all $z \in Z$.

Indeed, since W is infinite dimensional there exists a normalized basic sequence $(z_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ in W having basis constant at most equal to 2, such that $\|Tz_i\| \leq \eta/2^{i+2}$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $Z = \text{span}\{z_i \colon i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ be the linear span of the z_i's. Then Z is an infinite dimensional linear submanifold of W. We now show that Z satisfies the conclusion of the Claim. Let $z \in Z$ and write z in the form $z = \Sigma\lambda_i z_i$ for some scalars (λ_i) such that at most finitely many λ_i's are non-zero. Since the basis constant of $(z_i)_i$ is at most equal to 2, we have that $|\lambda_i| \leq 4\|z\|$ for all i. Thus

$$\|Tz\| = \left\|\sum_i \lambda_i T z_i\right\| \leq \sum_i |\lambda_i| \|Tz_i\| \leq \sum_i 4\|z\| \frac{\eta}{2^{i+2}} = \eta\|z\|$$

which finishes the proof of the Claim.

Let Y be an infinite dimensional subspace of X. Inductively for $i = 0, 1, \dots, k$, we define Z_i, a linear submanifold of X, such that

(a) Z_0 is an infinite dimensional linear submanifold of Y and Z_i is an infinite dimensional linear submanifold of $T(Z_{i-1})$ for $i \geq 1$.

(b) $\|Tz\| \leq \eta\|z\|$ for all $z \in Z_i$ and for all $i \geq 0$.

Indeed, since Y is infinite dimensional, we obtain Z_0 by applying the above Claim for $W = Y$. Obviously (a) and (b) are satisfied for $i = 0$. Assume that for some $i_0 \in \{0, 1, \dots, k-1\}$, a linear submanifold Z_{i_0} of X has been constructed satisfying (a) and (b) for $i = i_0$. Since T is 1-1 and Z_{i_0} is infinite dimensional we have that $T(Z_{i_0})$ is an infinite dimensional linear submanifold of X and we obtain Z_{i_0+1} by applying the above Claim for $W = T(Z_{i_0})$. Obviously (a) and (b) are satisfied for $i = i_0 + 1$. This finishes the inductive construction of the Z_i's. By (a) we obtain that Z_k is an infinite dimensional linear submanifold of $T^k(Y)$. Let $W = T^{-k}(Z_k)$. Then W is an infinite dimensional linear submanifold of X. Since $Z_k \subseteq T^k(Y)$ and T is 1-1, we have that $W \subseteq Y$. By (a) we obtain that for $i = 0, 1, \dots, k$ we have $Z_k \subseteq T^{k-i} Z_i$, hence

$$T^i W = T^i T^{-k} Z_k = T^{-(k-i)} Z_k \subseteq T^{-(k-i)} T^{k-i} Z_i = Z_i$$

(since T is 1-1). Thus by (b) we obtain that $\|T^i z\| \leq \eta\|T^{i-1}z\|$ for all $z \in W$ and $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$. Obviously, if Z is the closure of W then Z satisfies the statement of the lemma. $\square$

Corollary 2.5. *Let T be a strictly singular 1-1 operator on an infinite dimensional Banach space X. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\eta > 0$ and F be a finite codimensional subspace of X. Then for every infinite dimensional subspace Y of X there exists an infinite dimensional subspace Z of Y such that for all $z \in Z$ and for all $i = 1, \dots, k+1$*

$$T^{i-1}z \in F \quad \textit{and} \quad \|T^i z\| \le \eta \|T^{i-1}z\|$$

(where T^0 denotes the identity operator on X).

Proof. For any linear submanifold W of X and for any finite codimensional subspace F of X we have that

$$\dim(W/(F \cap W)) \le \dim(X/F) < \infty. \tag{9}$$

Indeed for any $n > \dim(X/F)$ and for any $x_1, \dots, x_n$ linear independent vectors in $W \backslash (F \cap W)$ we have that there exist scalars $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$ with $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \neq (0, \dots, 0)$ and $\sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i x_i \in F$ (since $n > \dim(X/F)$). Thus $\sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i x_i \in F \cap W$ which implies (9).

Let $R(T)$ denote the range of T. Apply (9) for $W = R(T)$ to obtain

$$\dim(R(T)/(R(T) \cap F) \le \dim(X/F) < \infty. \tag{10}$$

Since T is 1-1 we have that

$$\dim(X/T^{-1}(F)) \le \dim(R(T)/(R(T) \cap F)). \tag{11}$$

Indeed, for any $n > \dim(R(T)/(R(T) \cap F))$ and for any $x_1, \dots, x_n$ linear independent vectors of $X \backslash T^{-1}(F)$, we have that $Tx_1, \dots, Tx_n$ are linear independent vectors of $R(T) \backslash T(T^{-1}(F)) = R(T) \backslash F$ (since T is 1-1). Thus $Tx_1, \dots, Tx_n \in R(T) \backslash (R(T) \cap F)$ and since $n > \dim(R(T)/(R(T) \cap F))$, there exist scalars $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$ with $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \neq (0, \dots, 0)$ such that $\sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i T x_i \in R(T) \cap F$. Therefore $T\left(\sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i x_i\right) \in F$, and hence $\sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i x_i \in T^{-1}(F)$, which proves (11). By combining (10) and (11) we obtain

$$\dim(X/T^{-1}(F)) < \infty. \tag{12}$$

By (12) we have that

$$\dim(X/T^{-i}(F)) < \infty, \text{ for } i = 1, 2, \dots, k. \tag{13}$$

Thus $\dim(X/W_1) < \infty$ where $W_1 = F \cap T^{-1}(F) \cap \dots \cap T^{-k}(F)$. Therefore if we apply (9) for $W = Y$ and $F = W_1$ we obtain

$$\dim(Y/Y \cap W_1) \le \dim(X/W_1) < \infty, \tag{14}$$

and therefore $Y \cap W_1$ is infinite dimensional.

Now use Lemma 2.4, replacing Y by $Y \cap W_1$, to obtain an infinite dimensional subspace Z of $Y \cap W_1$ such that

$$\|T^i z\| \le \eta \|T^{i-1} z\|$$

for all $z \in Z$ and $i = 1, \dots, k+1$. Notice that for $z \in Z$ and $i = 1, \dots, k$ we have that $z \in W_1$ thus $T^{i-1}z \in F$. □

Now we are ready to give the

Proof of Theorem 2.3. We prove by induction on k that for every infinite dimensional subspace Y of X, finite codimensional subspace F of X, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, function $f\colon (0,1) \to (0,1)$ such that $f(\eta) \searrow 0$ as $\eta \searrow 0$, and for $i_0 \in \{0\} \cup \mathbb{N}$, there exists $\eta_0 > 0$ such that for every $0 < \eta \le \eta_0$ there exists $x \in Y$, $\|x\| = 1$ satisfying

(a$'$) $T^{i-1}x \in F$ and $\|T^i x\| \le \eta \|T^{i-1}x\|$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, i_0 + k + 1$.

(b$'$) $\mathrm{bc}\left\{\frac{T^{i_0}x}{\|T^{i_0}x\|}, \frac{T^{i_0+1}x}{\|T^{i_0+1}x\|}, \dots, \frac{T^{i_0+k}x}{\|T^{i_0+k}x\|}\right\} \le \frac{1}{f(\eta)}$.

For $k = 1$ let Y, F, f, and i_0 as above, and let $\eta_0 \in (0,1)$ satisfying

$$f(\eta_0) < \frac{1}{62}. \tag{15}$$

Let $0 < \eta \le \eta_0$. Apply Corollary 2.5 for k and η replaced by $i_0 + 1$ and $\eta/4$ respectively, to obtain an infinite dimensional subspace Z_1 of Y such that for all $z \in Z_1$ and for $i = 1, 2, \dots, i_0 + 2$

$$T^{i-1}z \in F \quad \text{and} \quad \|T^i z\| \le \frac{\eta}{4}\|T^{i-1}z\|. \tag{16}$$

Let $x_1 \in Z_1$ with $\|x_1\| = 1$. If $\mathrm{bc}\{T^{i_0}x_1/\|T^{i_0}x_1\|,\ T^{i_0+1}x_1/\|T^{i_0+1}x_1\|\} \le 1/f(\eta)$ then x_1 satisfies (a$'$) and (b$'$) for $k = 1$, thus we may assume that

$$\mathrm{bc}\left\{\frac{T^{i_0}x_1}{\|T^{i_0}x_1\|}, \frac{T^{i_0+1}x_1}{\|T^{i_0+1}x_1\|}\right\} > \frac{1}{f(\eta)}. \tag{17}$$

Let

$$0 < \eta_2 \le \frac{\eta}{4} \wedge \min_{1 \le i \le i_0} \frac{\|T^{i_0}x_1\|}{2\|T^i x_1\|} \wedge \min_{i_0 < i \le i_0+2} \frac{\|T^i x_1\|}{2\|T^{i_0}x_1\|} f(\eta). \tag{18}$$

Let $z_1^*, z_2^* \in X^*$, $\|z_1^*\| = \|z_2^*\| = 1$, $z_1^*(T^{i_0}x_1) = \|T^{i_0}x_1\|$ and $z_2^*(T^{i_0+1}x_1) = \|T^{i_0+1}x_1\|$. Since $\ker z_1^* \cap \ker z_2^*$ is finite codimensional and T is 1-1, by (13) we have that

$$\dim(X/T^{-i_0}(\ker z_1^* \cap \ker z_2^*)) < \infty. \tag{19}$$

Apply Corollary 2.5 for F, k and η replaced by $F \cap T^{-i_0}(\ker z_1^* \cap \ker z_2^*)$, $i_0 + 2$ and η_2 respectively, to obtain an infinite dimensional subspace Z_2 of Y such that for all $z \in Z_2$ and for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, i_0 + 2$

$$T^{i-1}z \in F \cap T^{-i_0}(\ker z_1^* \cap \ker z_2^*) \quad \text{and} \quad \|T^i z\| \le \eta_2 \|T^{i-1}z\|. \tag{20}$$

Let $x_1^* \in X^*$ with $\|x_1^*\| = x_1^*(x_1) = 1$ and let $x_2 \in Z_2 \cap \ker x_1^*$ with

$$\|T^{i_0}x_1\| = \|T^{i_0}x_2\| \tag{21}$$

and let $x = (x_1 + x_2)/\|x_1 + x_2\|$. We will show that x satisfies (a$'$) and (b$'$) for $k = 1$.

We first show that (a$'$) is satisfied for $k = 1$. Since $x_1, Tx_1, \dots, T^{i_0+1}x_1 \in F$ (by (16)) and $x_2, Tx_2, \dots, T^{i_0+1}x_2 \in F$ (by (20)) we have that $x, Tx, \dots, T^{i_0+1}x \in F$. Before showing that the norm estimate of (a$'$) is satisfied, we need some preliminary estimates: (22)-(31).

If $1 \le i < i_0$ (assuming that $2 \le i_0$) then

$$\begin{aligned} \|T^i x_1\| &= \frac{1}{2}\|T^{i_0}x_1\|\left(\frac{\|T^{i_0}x_1\|}{2\|T^i x_1\|}\right)^{-1} \\ &\le \frac{1}{2}\|T^{i_0}x_1\|\eta_2^{-1} && \text{(by (18))} \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\|T^{i_0}x_2\|\eta_2^{-1} && \text{(by (21))} \\ &\le \frac{1}{2}\eta_2^{i_0-i}\|T^i x_2\|\eta_2^{-1} && \text{(by applying (20) for } z = x_2,\ i_0 - i \text{ times)} \\ &\le \frac{1}{2}\|T^i x_2\| && \text{(since } \eta_2 \le 1 \text{ by (18)).} \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

Thus, by (22), for $1 \le i < i_0$ (assuming that $2 \le i_0$) we have

$$\|T^i x\|\|x_1 + x_2\| = \|T^i x_1 + T^i x_2\| \le \|T^i x_1\| + \|T^i x_2\| \le \frac{3}{2}\|T^i x_2\| \tag{23}$$

and

$$\|T^i x\|\|x_1 + x_2\| = \|T^i x_1 + T^i x_2\| \ge \|T^i x_2\| - \|T^i x_1\| \ge \frac{1}{2}\|T^i x_2\|. \tag{24}$$

Also notice that

$$\|T^{i_0} x\|\|x_1 + x_2\| = \|T^{i_0}x_1 + T^{i_0}x_2\| \le \|T^{i_0}x_1\| + \|T^{i_0}x_2\| = 2\|T^{i_0}x_1\| \text{ (by (21))}, \tag{25}$$

and

$$\|T^{i_0} x\|\|x_1 + x_2\| = \|T^{i_0}x_1 + T^{i_0}x_2\| \ge z_1^*(T^{i_0}x_1 + T^{i_0}x_2) = z_1^*(T^{i_0}x_1) = \|T^{i_0}x_1\| \tag{26}$$

(by (20) for $z = x_2$ and $i = 1$). Also for $i_0 < i \le i_0 + 2$ we have that by applying (20) for $z = x_2$, $i - i_0$ times, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|T^i x_2\| &\le \eta_2^{i-i_0}\|T^{i_0}x_2\| \\ &\le \eta_2\|T^{i_0}x_1\| \quad \text{(by } \eta_2 < 1 \text{ and (21))} \\ &= \eta_2\frac{2\|T^{i_0}x_1\|}{\|T^i x_1\|}\frac{1}{2}\|T^i x_1\| \\ &\le \frac{1}{2}f(\eta)\|T^i x_1\| \quad \text{(by (18))} && (27) \\ &\le \frac{1}{2}\|T^i x_1\|. && (28) \end{aligned}$$

Thus for $i_0 < i \le i_0 + 2$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|T^i x\|\|x_1 + x_2\| &= \|T^i x_1 + T^i x_2\| \\ &\le \|T^i x_1\| + \|T^i x_2\| \\ &\le \frac{3}{2}\|T^i x_1\| \quad \text{(by (28)).} \end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

Also for $i_0 < i \leq i_0 + 2$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|T^i x\| \|x_1 + x_2\| &= \|T^i x_1 + T^i x_2\| \\ &\geq \|T^i x_1\| - \|T^i x_2\| \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2}\|T^i x_1\| \quad \text{(by (28))}. \end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

Later in the course of this proof we will also need that

$$\begin{aligned} \|T^{i_0+1} x\| \|x_1 + x_2\| &= \|T^{i_0+1} x_1 + T^{i_0+1} x_2\| \\ &\geq \|T^{i_0+1} x_1\| - \|T^{i_0+1} x_2\| \\ &\geq \frac{2}{f(\eta)}\|T^{i_0+1} x_2\| - \|T^{i_0+1} x_2\| \quad \text{(by (27))} \\ &= \frac{2 - f(\eta)}{f(\eta)}\|T^{i_0+1} x_2\| \\ &\geq \frac{1}{f(\eta)}\|T^{i_0+1} x_2\| \qquad \text{(since } f(\eta) < 1). \end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

Finally we will show that for $1 \leq i \leq i_0 + 2$ we have that $\|T^i x\| \leq \eta \|T^{i-1} x\|$. Indeed if $i = 1$ then

$$\begin{aligned} \|T^i x\| &= \frac{1}{\|x_1 + x_2\|}\|T x_1 + T x_2\| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\|x_1 + x_2\|}(\|T x_1\| + \|T x_2\|) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\|x_1 + x_2\|}\left(\frac{\eta}{4}\|x_1\| + \eta_2 \|x_2\|\right) && \text{(by (16) } (z = x_1)\text{, and (20) } (z = x_2)) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\|x_1 + x_2\|}\left(\frac{\eta}{4}\|x_1\| + \eta_2(\|x_1 + x_2\| + \|x_1\|)\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{\|x_1 + x_2\|}\left(\frac{\eta}{4} + \eta_2\right) x_1^*(x_1) + \eta_2 && \text{(by the choice of } x_1^*) \\ &= \frac{1}{\|x_1 + x_2\|}\left(\frac{\eta}{4} + \eta_2\right) x_1^*(x_1 + x_2) + \eta_2 && \text{(since } x_2 \in \ker x_1^*) \\ &\leq \frac{\eta}{4} + 2\eta_2 && \text{(since } \|x_1^*\| = 1) \\ &\leq \eta && \left(\text{since } \eta_2 < \frac{\eta}{4} \text{ by (18)}\right). \end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

If $1 < i < i_0$ (assuming that $3 \leq i_0$) we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\|T^i x\|}{\|T^{i-1} x\|} &\leq \frac{\frac{3}{2}\|T^i x_2\|}{\frac{1}{2}\|T^{i-1} x_2\|} \quad \text{(by (23) and (24))} \\ &< 3\eta_2 \qquad \text{(by (20))} \\ &< \eta \qquad \text{(by (18))}. \end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

If $i = i_0 > 1$ then

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\|T^i x\|}{\|T^{i-1}x\|} &\le \frac{2\|T^{i_0}x_1\|}{\frac{1}{2}\|T^{i_0-1}x_2\|} && \text{(by (25) and (24))} \\
&= 4\frac{\|T^{i_0}x_2\|}{\|T^{i_0-1}x_2\|} && \text{(by (21))} \\
&< 4\eta_2 && \text{(by (20) for } z = x_2 \text{ and } i = 1) \\
&< \eta && \text{(by (18)).} \qquad (34)
\end{aligned}$$

If $i_0 < i \le i_0 + 2$ then

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\|T^i x\|}{\|T^{i-1}x\|} &\le \frac{\frac{3}{2}\|T^{i}x_1\|}{\frac{1}{2}\|T^{i-1}x_1\|} && \text{(by (29) and (30))} \\
&< \eta && \text{(by (16) for } z = x_1). \qquad (35)
\end{aligned}$$

Now (32), (33), (34) and (35) yield that for $1 \le i \le i_0 + 2$ we have $\|T^i x\| \le \eta\|T^{i-1}x\|$, thus x satisfies (a$'$) for $k = 1$. Before proving that x satisfies (b$'$) for $k = 1$ we need some preliminary estimates: (36)-(40). By (17) there exist scalars a_0, a_1 with $\max(|a_0|, |a_1|) = 1$ and $\|w\| < f(\eta)$ where

$$w = a_0\frac{T^{i_0}x_1}{\|T^{i_0}x_1\|} + a_1\frac{T^{i_0+1}x_1}{\|T^{i_0+1}x_1\|}. \qquad (36)$$

Therefore

$$||a_0| - |a_1|| = \left|\left\|a_0\frac{T^{i_0}x_1}{\|T^{i_0}x_1\|}\right\| - \left\|a_1\frac{T^{i_0+1}x_1}{\|T^{i_0+1}x_1\|}\right\|\right| \le \|w\| < f(\eta).$$

Thus $1 - f(\eta) \le |a_0|, |a_1| \le 1$ and hence

$$\frac{|a_1|}{|a_0|} \le \frac{1}{|a_0|} \le \frac{1}{1 - f(\eta)}. \qquad (37)$$

Also by (36) we obtain that

$$T^{i_0}x_1 = \frac{\|T^{i_0}x_1\|}{a_0}w - \|T^{i_0}x_1\|\frac{a_1}{a_0}\frac{T^{i_0+1}x_1}{\|T^{i_0+1}x_1\|}$$

and thus

$$T^{i_0}x = \frac{1}{\|x_1 + x_2\|}\left(\frac{\|T^{i_0}x_1\|}{a_0}w - \|T^{i_0}x_1\|\frac{a_1}{a_0}\frac{T^{i_0+1}x_1}{\|T^{i_0+1}x_1\|} + T^{i_0}x_2\right). \qquad (38)$$

Let

$$\widetilde{w} = T^{i_0}x + \frac{\|T^{i_0}x_1\|}{\|x_1 + x_2\|}\frac{a_1}{a_0}\frac{T^{i_0+1}x_1}{\|T^{i_0+1}x_1\|} - \frac{T^{i_0}x_2}{\|x_1 + x_2\|}. \qquad (39)$$

Notice that (38) and (39) imply that $\widetilde{w} = (\|T^{i_0}x_1\|/(\|x_1+x_2\|a_0))w$ and hence

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\widetilde{w}\| &= \frac{\|T^{i_0}x_1\|}{\|x_1+x_2\||a_0|}\|w\| \le \frac{\|T^{i_0}x_1\|}{\|x_1+x_2\|}\frac{f(\eta)}{1-f(\eta)} \quad (\text{using (37) and } \|w\| < f(\eta))\\
&\le 2f(\eta)\frac{\|T^{i_0}x_1\|}{\|x_1+x_2\|} \quad \left(\text{since } \frac{1}{1-f(\eta)} < 2 \text{ by (15)}\right)\\
&= 2f(\eta)\frac{z_1^*(T^{i_0}x_1)}{\|x_1+x_2\|} \quad (\text{by the choice of } z_1^*)\\
&= 2f(\eta)\frac{z_1^*(T^{i_0}x_1+T^{i_0}x_2)}{\|x_1+x_2\|} \quad (\text{by (20) for } i=1 \text{ and } z=x_2)\\
&\le 2f(\eta)\frac{\|T^{i_0}(x_1+x_2)\|}{\|x_1+x_2\|} \quad (\text{since } \|z_1^*\|=1)\\
&= 2f(\eta)\|T^{i_0}x\|.
\end{aligned}\tag{40}$$

Now we are ready to estimate the $\mathrm{bc}\{T^{i_0}x/\|T^{i_0}x\|, T^{i_0+1}x/\|T^{i_0+1}x\|\}$. Let scalars A_0, A_1 such that

$$\left\|A_0\frac{T^{i_0}x}{\|T^{i_0}x\|} + A_1\frac{T^{i_0+1}x}{\|T^{i_0+1}x\|}\right\| = 1.$$

We want to estimate the $\max(|A_0|,|A_1|)$. By (39) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
1 &= \left\|\frac{A_0}{\|T^{i_0}x\|}\left(\widetilde{w} - \frac{\|T^{i_0}x_1\|}{\|x_1+x_2\|}\frac{a_1}{a_0}\frac{T^{i_0+1}x_1}{\|T^{i_0+1}x_1\|} + \frac{T^{i_0}x_2}{\|x_1+x_2\|}\right) + A_1\frac{T^{i_0+1}x}{\|T^{i_0+1}x\|}\right\|\\
&= \left\|\frac{A_0\|T^{i_0}x_2\|}{\|T^{i_0}x\|\|x_1+x_2\|}\frac{T^{i_0}x_2}{\|T^{i_0}x_2\|} + \left(\frac{-A_0\|T^{i_0}x_1\|}{\|T^{i_0}x\|\|x_1+x_2\|}\frac{a_1}{a_0} + \frac{A_1\|T^{i_0+1}x_1\|}{\|T^{i_0+1}x\|\|x_1+x_2\|}\right)\frac{T^{i_0+1}x_1}{\|T^{i_0+1}x_1\|}\right.\\
&\qquad \left. + \frac{A_0}{\|T^{i_0}x\|}\widetilde{w} + \frac{A_1T^{i_0+1}x_2}{\|T^{i_0+1}x\|\|x_1+x_2\|}\right\|\\
&\ge \left\|\frac{A_0\|T^{i_0}x_2\|}{\|T^{i_0}x\|\|x_1+x_2\|}\frac{T^{i_0}x_2}{\|T^{i_0}x_2\|} + \left(\frac{-A_0\|T^{i_0}x_1\|}{\|T^{i_0}x\|\|x_1+x_2\|}\frac{a_1}{a_0} + \frac{A_1\|T^{i_0+1}x_1\|}{\|T^{i_0+1}x\|\|x_1+x_2\|}\right)\frac{T^{i_0+1}x_1}{\|T^{i_0+1}x_1\|}\right\|\\
&\qquad - |A_0|2f(\eta) - |A_1|f(\eta) \quad (\text{by the triangle inequality, (40) and (31)}).
\end{aligned}\tag{41}$$

By (20) for $i=1$ we have that $T^{i_0}x_2 \in \ker z_2^*$ and since $z_2^*(T^{i_0+1}x_1) = \|T^{i_0+1}x_1\|$ it is easy to see that $\mathrm{bc}\{T^{i_0}x_2/\|T^{i_0}x_2\|,\, T^{i_0+1}x_1/\|T^{i_0+1}x_1\|\} \le 2$. Thus (41) implies that

$$\left|-\frac{A_0\|T^{i_0}x_1\|}{\|T^{i_0}x\|\|x_1+x_2\|}\frac{a_1}{a_0} + \frac{A_1\|T^{i_0+1}x_1\|}{\|T^{i_0+1}x\|\|x_1+x_2\|}\right| \le 2 + 4f(\eta)|A_0| + 2f(\eta)|A_1| \tag{42}$$

and

$$\frac{|A_0|\|T^{i_0}x_2\|}{\|T^{i_0}x\|\|x_1+x_2\|} \le 2 + 4f(\eta)|A_0| + 2f(\eta)|A_1|. \tag{43}$$

Notice that (43) implies that

$$|A_0| \le 4 + 8f(\eta)|A_0| + 4f(\eta)|A_1|, \tag{44}$$

since

$$\frac{\|T^{i_0}x\|\|x_1+x_2\|}{\|T^{i_0}x_2\|} = \frac{\|T^{i_0}x_1+T^{i_0}x_2\|}{\|T^{i_0}x_2\|} \leq \frac{\|T^{i_0}x_1\|+\|T^{i_0}x_2\|}{\|T^{i_0}x_2\|} = 2$$

by (21). Also by (42) we obtain

$$\frac{|A_1|\|T^{i_0+1}x_1\|}{\|T^{i_0+1}x\|\|x_1+x_2\|} - \frac{|A_0|\|T^{i_0}x_1\|}{\|T^{i_0}x\|\|x_1+x_2\|}\frac{|a_1|}{|a_0|} \leq 2 + 4f(\eta)|A_0| + 2f(\eta)|A_1|.$$

Thus

$$|A_1|\frac{2}{3} - |A_0|\frac{1}{1-f(\eta)} \leq 2 + 4f(\eta)|A_0| + 2f(\eta)|A_1| \tag{45}$$

by (29) for $i = i_0+1$, (37) and

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\|T^{i_0}x_1\|}{\|T^{i_0}x\|\|x_1+x_2\|} &= \frac{\|T^{i_0}x_1\|}{\|T^{i_0}x_1+T^{i_0}x_2\|} \leq \frac{\|T^{i_0}x_1\|}{z_1^*(T^{i_0}x_1+T^{i_0}x_2)} \quad (\text{since } \|z_1^*\|=1) \\
&= \frac{\|T^{i_0}x_1\|}{z_1^*(T^{i_0}x_1)} \quad (\text{since } x_2 \in T^{-i_0}(\ker z_1^*) \text{ by (20) for } i=1 \text{ and } z=x_2) \\
&= 1 \quad (\text{by the choice of } z_1^*).
\end{aligned}$$

Notice that (45) implies that

$$|A_1| \leq 6 + \frac{28}{5}|A_0| \tag{46}$$

since $f(\eta) < 1/6$ by (15). By substituting (46) into (44) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
|A_0| &\leq 4 + 8f(\eta)|A_0| + 4f(\eta)\left(6 + \frac{28}{5}|A_0|\right) \\
&= 4 + 24f(\eta) + \frac{112}{5}f(\eta)|A_0| \\
&\leq 5 + \frac{1}{2}|A_0| \quad \left(\text{since } f(\eta) < \frac{5}{224} \text{ by (15)}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus $|A_0| \leq 10$. Hence (46) gives that $|A_1| \leq 62$. Therefore

$$\mathrm{bc}\left\{\frac{T^{i_0}x}{\|T^{i_0}x\|}, \frac{T^{i_0+1}x}{\|T^{i_0+1}x\|}\right\} \leq 62 \leq \frac{1}{f(\eta)} \quad (\text{by (15)}).$$

We now proceed to the inductive step. Assuming the inductive statement for some integer k, let a finite codimensional subspace F of X, $f\colon (0,1) \to (0,1)$ with $f(\eta) \searrow 0$ as $\eta \searrow 0$ and $i_0 \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. By the inductive statement for i_0, f and η replaced by i_0+1, $f^{1/4}$ and $\eta/4$ respectively, there exists η_1 s.t. for $0 < \eta < \eta_1$ there exists $x_1 \in X$, $\|x_1\| = 1$

$$T^{i-1}x_1 \in F \text{ and } \|T^i x_1\| \leq \frac{\eta}{4}\|T^{i-1}x_1\| \text{ for } i = 1, 2, \dots, (i_0+1)+k+1 \tag{47}$$

and

$$\mathrm{bc}\left\{\frac{T^{i_0+1}x_1}{\|T^{i_0+1}x_1\|}, \frac{T^{i_0+2}x_1}{\|T^{i_0+2}x_1\|}, \dots, \frac{T^{i_0+1+k}x_1}{\|T^{i_0+1+k}x_1\|}\right\} \leq \frac{1}{f(\eta)^{1/4}}. \tag{48}$$

Let η_0 satisfying

$$\eta_0 < \eta_1, \quad f(\eta_0) < \frac{1}{288^2}, \quad f(\eta_0) < \left(\frac{1}{144(k+1)}\right)^2, \tag{49}$$

let $0 < \eta < \eta_0$ and let $x_1 \in X$, $\|x_1\| = 1$ satisfying (47) and (48). If

$$\operatorname{bc}\left\{\frac{T^{i_0}x_1}{\|T^{i_0}x_1\|}, \frac{T^{i_0+1}x_1}{\|T^{i_0+1}x_1\|}, \dots, \frac{T^{i_0+k+1}x_1}{\|T^{i_0+k+1}x_1\|}\right\} \le \frac{1}{f(\eta)}$$

then x_1 satisfies the inductive step for k replaced by $k+1$. Thus we may assume that

$$\operatorname{bc}\left\{\frac{T^{i_0}x_1}{\|T^{i_0}x_1\|}, \frac{T^{i_0+1}x_1}{\|T^{i_0+1}x_1\|}, \dots, \frac{T^{i_0+k+1}x_1}{\|T^{i_0+k+1}x_1\|}\right\} > \frac{1}{f(\eta)}. \tag{50}$$

Let

$$0 < \eta_2 < \frac{\eta}{4} \wedge \min_{1 \le i \le i_0} \frac{\|T^{i_0}x_1\|}{2\|T^i x_1\|} \wedge \min_{i_0 < i \le i_0+k+1} \frac{\|T^i x_1\|}{2\|T^{i_0}x_1\|} f(\eta). \tag{51}$$

Let $J \subset \{2, 3, \dots\}$ be a finite index set and $z_1^*, (z_j^*)_{j\in J}$ be norm 1 functionals such that

$$z_1^*(T^{i_0}x_1) = \|T^{i_0}x_1\|, \tag{52}$$

and

$$\text{for every } z \in \operatorname{span}\{T^{i_0+1}x_1, \dots, T^{i_0+k+1}x_1\} \text{ there exists } j_0 \in J \text{ with } |z_{j_0}^*(z)| \ge \frac{1}{2}\|z\|. \tag{53}$$

Since T is 1-1 we obtain by (13) that $\dim(X/(T^{-i_0} \bigcap_{j\in\{1\}\cup J} \ker z_j^*)) < \infty$. Apply Corollary 2.5 for F, k, η replaced by $F \cap T^{-i_0}\left(\bigcap_{j\in\{1\}\cup J} \ker z_i^*\right)$, i_0+k+2, η_2 respectively, to obtain an infinite dimensional subspace Z of Y such that for all $z \in Z$ and for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, i_0+k+2$

$$T^{i-1}z \in F \cap T^{-i_0}\left(\bigcap_{j\in\{1\}\cup J} \ker z_j^*\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \|T^i z\| \le \eta_2 \|T^{i-1}z\|. \tag{54}$$

Let $x_1^* \in X^*$, $\|x_1^*\| = 1 = x_1^*(x_1)$ and let $x_2 \in Z \cap \ker x_1^*$ with

$$\|T^{i_0}x_1\| = \|T^{i_0}x_2\| \tag{55}$$

and let $x = (x_1 + x_2)/\|x_1 + x_2\|$. We will show that x satisfies the inductive statement for k replaced by $k+1$.

We first show that x satisfies (a$'$) for k replaced by $k+1$. The proof is identical to the verification of (a$'$) for $k = 1$. The formulas (27), (28), (29), (30), and (35) are valid for $i_0 < i \le i_0+k+2$, and (31) is valid if i_0+1 is replaced by any $i \in \{i_0+1, \dots, i_0+k+1\}$, and *this will be assumed in the rest of the proof when we refer to these formulas.*

We now prove that (b$'$) is satisfied for k replaced by $k+1$. By (50) there exist scalars $a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{k+1}$ with $\max(|a_0|, |a_1|, \dots, |a_{k+1}|) = 1$ and $\|w\| < f(\eta)$ where

$$w = \sum_{i=0}^{k+1} a_i \frac{T^{i_0+i}x_1}{\|T^{i_0+i}x_1\|}. \tag{56}$$

We claim that

$$|a_0| \geq \frac{f(\eta)^{1/4}}{2}. \tag{57}$$

Indeed, if $|a_0| < f(\eta)^{1/4}/2$ then $\max(|a_1|, \dots, |a_{k+1}|) = 1$ and

$$\begin{aligned}\left\| \sum_{i=1}^{k+1} a_i \frac{T^{i_0+1}x_1}{\|T^{i_0+i}x_1\|} \right\| &= \left\| w - a_0 \frac{T^{i_0}x_1}{\|T^{i_0}x_1\|} \right\| \\ &\leq \|w\| + |a_0| \\ &< f(\eta) + \frac{f(\eta)^{1/4}}{2} \\ &< f(\eta)^{1/4} \quad \text{(since } f(\eta) < 1/4 \text{ by (49))}\end{aligned}$$

which contradicts (48). Thus (57) is proved. By (56) we obtain

$$T^{i_0}x_1 = \frac{\|T^{i_0}x_1\|}{a_0} w - \sum_{i=1}^{k+1} \frac{a_i}{a_0} \|T^{i_0}x_1\| \frac{T^{i_0+i}x_1}{\|T^{i_0+i}x_1\|}$$

and thus

$$T^{i_0}x = \frac{1}{\|x_1 + x_2\|} \left(\frac{\|T^{i_0}x_1\|}{a_0} w - \sum_{i=1}^{k+1} \frac{a_i}{a_0} \|T^{i_0}x_1\| \frac{T^{i_0+i}x_1}{\|T^{i_0+i}x_1\|} + T^{i_0}x_2 \right). \tag{58}$$

Let

$$\widetilde{w} = T^{i_0}x + \sum_{i=1}^{k+1} \frac{a_i}{a_0} \frac{\|T^{i_0}x_1\|}{\|x_1 + x_2\|} \frac{T^{i_0+i}x_1}{\|T^{i_0+i}x_1\|} - \frac{T^{i_0}x_2}{\|x_1 + x_2\|}. \tag{59}$$

Notice that (58) and (59) imply that $\widetilde{w} = (\|T^{i_0}x_1\|/(\|x_1 + x_2\|a_0))w$ and hence

$$\begin{aligned}\|\widetilde{w}\| &= \frac{\|T^{i_0}x_1\|}{\|x_1 + x_2\||a_0|} \|w\| < \frac{\|T^{i_0}x_1\|}{\|x_1 + x_2\|} 2f(\eta)^{3/4} \quad \text{(by } \|w\| \leq f(\eta) \text{ and (57))} \\ &= \frac{z_1^*(T^{i_0}x_1)}{\|x_1 + x_2\|} 2f(\eta)^{3/4} \quad \text{(by (52))} \\ &= \frac{z_1^*(T^{i_0}x_1 + T^{i_0}x_2)}{\|x_1 + x_2\|} 2f(\eta)^{3/4} \text{(by (54) for } i = 1 \text{ and } z = x_2) \\ &\leq \frac{\|T^{i_0}(x_1 + x_2)\|}{\|x_1 + x_2\|} 2f(\eta)^{3/4} \quad \text{(since } \|z_1^*\| = 1) \\ &= \|T^{i_0}x\| 2f(\eta)^{3/4}. \qquad (60)\end{aligned}$$

Now we are ready to estimate the $\mathrm{bc}\{T^{i_0+i}x_1/\|T^{i_0+i}x_1\| : \ i = 0, 1, \dots, k+1\}$. Let scalars $A_0, A_1, \dots, A_{k+1}$ such that

$$\left\| \sum_{i=0}^{k+1} A_i \frac{T^{i_0+i}x}{\|T^{i_0+i}x\|} \right\| = 1.$$

We want to estimate the $\max(|A_0|, |A_1|, \dots, |A_{k+1}|)$. By (59) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
1 &= \left\| \frac{A_0}{\|T^{i_0}x\|}\left(\widetilde{w} - \sum_{i=1}^{k+1} \frac{a_i}{a_0}\frac{\|T^{i_0}x_1\|}{\|x_1+x_2\|}\frac{T^{i_0+i}x_1}{\|T^{i_0+i}x_1\|} + \frac{T^{i_0}x_2}{\|x_1+x_2\|}\right) + \sum_{i=1}^{k+1} A_i \frac{T^{i_0+i}x}{\|T^{i_0+i}x\|}\right\| \\
&= \left\| \frac{A_0\|T^{i_0}x_2\|}{\|T^{i_0}x\|\|x_1+x_2\|}\frac{T^{i_0}x_2}{\|T^{i_0}x_2\|} + \sum_{i=1}^{k+1}\left(\frac{a_i}{a_0}\frac{-A_0\|T^{i_0}x_1\|}{\|T^{i_0}x\|\|x_1+x_2\|} + \frac{A_i\|T^{i_0+i}x_1\|}{\|T^{i_0+i}x\|\|x_1+x_2\|}\right)\frac{T^{i_0+i}x_1}{\|T^{i_0+i}x_1\|} \right. \\
&\qquad \left. + \frac{A_0}{\|T^{i_0}x\|}\widetilde{w} + \sum_{i=1}^{k+1} A_i \frac{T^{i_0+i}x_2}{\|T^{i_0+i}x\|\|x_1+x_2\|} \right\| \\
&\geq \left\| \frac{A_0\|T^{i_0}x_2\|}{\|T^{i_0}x\|\|x_1+x_2\|}\frac{T^{i_0}x_2}{\|T^{i_0}x_2\|} + \sum_{i=1}^{k+1}\left(\frac{a_i}{a_0}\frac{-A_0\|T^{i_0}x_1\|}{\|T^{i_0}x\|\|x_1+x_2\|} + \frac{A_i\|T^{i_0+i}x_1\|}{\|T^{i_0+i}x\|\|x_1+x_2\|}\right)\frac{T^{i_0+i}x_1}{\|T^{i_0+i}x_1\|} \right\| \\
&\qquad - |A_0| 2 f(\eta)^{3/4} - \sum_{i=1}^{k+1} |A_i| f(\eta) \quad \text{(by (60) and (31); see the paragraph above (56)).}
\end{aligned} \tag{61}$$

By (54) for $i = 1$ and $z = x_2$ we obtain that $T^{i_0}x_2 \in \bigcap_{j\in J} \ker z_j^*$ and by (53) and (48) it is easy to see that

$$\operatorname{bc}\left\{ \frac{T^{i_0}x_2}{\|T^{i_0}x_2\|}, \frac{T^{i_0+i}x_1}{\|T^{i_0+i}x_1\|} \colon\ i = 1, \dots, k+1 \right\} \leq \frac{2}{f(\eta)^{1/4}} \vee 3.$$

Since $f(\eta) < \left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^4$ (by (49)), we have that $3 \leq 2/f(\eta)^{1/4}$, hence

$$\operatorname{bc}\left\{ \frac{T^{i_0}x_2}{\|T^{i_0}x_2\|}, \frac{T^{i_0+i}x_1}{\|T^{i_0+i}x_1\|} \colon\ i = 1, \dots, k+1 \right\} \leq \frac{2}{f(\eta)^{1/4}}.$$

Thus (61) implies that

$$|A_0| \frac{\|T^{i_0}x_2\|}{\|T^{i_0}x\|\|x_1+x_2\|} \leq \frac{2}{f(\eta)^{1/4}}\left(1 + 2f(\eta)^{3/4}|A_0| + \sum_{j=1}^{k+1}|A_j| f(\eta)\right), \tag{62}$$

and for $i = 1, \dots, k+1$

$$\left| \frac{a_i}{a_0}\frac{-A_0\|T^{i_0}x_1\|}{\|T^{i_0}x\|\|x_1+x_2\|} + \frac{A_i\|T^{i_0+i}x_1\|}{\|T^{i_0+i}x\|\|x_1+x_2\|} \right| \leq \frac{2}{f(\eta)^{1/4}}\left(1 + 2f(\eta)^{\frac{3}{4}}|A_0| + \sum_{j=1}^{k+1}|A_j| f(\eta)\right). \tag{63}$$

Since

$$\frac{\|T^{i_0}x\|\|x_1+x_2\|}{\|T^{i_0}x_2\|} = \frac{\|T^{i_0}x_1 + T^{i_0}x_2\|}{\|T^{i_0}x_2\|} \leq \frac{\|T^{i_0}x_1\| + \|T^{i_0}x_2\|}{\|T^{i_0}x_2\|} = 2 \quad \text{(by (55))},$$

we have that (62) implies

$$|A_0| \leq \frac{4}{f(\eta)^{1/4}} + 8f(\eta)^{1/2}|A_0| + 4\sum_{j=1}^{k+1}|A_j| f(\eta)^{3/4}. \tag{64}$$

Notice also that (63) implies that for $i = 1, \dots, k+1$

$$|A_i| \frac{\|T^{i_0+i}x_1\|}{\|T^{i_0+i}x\| \|x_1 + x_2\|} - |A_0| \frac{|a_i|}{|a_0|} \frac{\|T^{i_0}x_1\|}{\|T^{i_0}x\| \|x_1 + x_2\|} \le \frac{2}{f(\eta)^{1/4}} + 4f(\eta)^{\frac{1}{2}}|A_0| + 2\sum_{j=1}^{k+1} |A_j| f(\eta)^{\frac{3}{4}}.$$

Thus

$$|A_i|\frac{2}{3} - |A_0|\frac{2}{f(\eta)^{1/4}} \le \frac{2}{f(\eta)^{1/4}} + 4f(\eta)^{\frac{1}{2}}|A_0| + 2\sum_{j=1}^{k+1} |A_j| f(\eta)^{\frac{3}{4}} \tag{65}$$

by (29) (see the paragraph above (56)), (57) and

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\|T^{i_0}x_1\|}{\|T^{i_0}x\| \|x_1 + x_2\|} &= \frac{\|T^{i_0}x_1\|}{\|T^{i_0}x_1 + T^{i_0}x_2\|} \le \frac{\|T^{i_0}x_1\|}{|z_1^*(T^{i_0}x_1 + T^{i_0}x_2)|} \quad \text{(since } \|z_1^*\| = 1\text{)} \\
&= \frac{\|T^{i_0}x_1\|}{|z_1^*(T^{i_0}x_1)|} \quad \text{(since } T^{i_0}x_2 \in \ker z_1^* \text{ by (54) for } i = 1 \text{ and } z = x_2\text{)} \\
&= 1 \quad \text{(by (52))}.
\end{aligned}$$

For $i = 1, \dots, k+1$ rewrite (65) as

$$|A_i| \left(\frac{2}{3} - 2f(\eta)^{3/4}\right) \le \frac{2}{f(\eta)^{1/4}} + \left(4f(\eta)^{1/2} + \frac{2}{f(\eta)^{1/4}}\right)|A_0| + \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \ne i}}^{k+1} |A_j| f(\eta)^{3/4}.$$

Thus, since $f(\eta) < \left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{4/3} \wedge \left(\frac{1}{4}\right)^{1/2}$ (by (49)), we obtain

$$|A_i|\frac{1}{3} \le \frac{2}{f(\eta)^{1/4}} + \left(1 + \frac{2}{f(\eta)^{1/4}}\right)|A_0| + \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \ne i}}^{k+1} |A_j| f(\eta)^{3/4}.$$

Hence, since $1 \le 1/f(\eta)^{1/4}$, we obtain that for $i = 1, \dots, k+1$

$$|A_i| \le \frac{6}{f(\eta)^{1/4}} + \frac{9}{f(\eta)^{1/4}}|A_0| + 3\sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \ne i}}^{k+1} |A_j| f(\eta)^{3/4}. \tag{66}$$

By substituting (64) in (66) we obtain that for $i = 1, \dots, k+1$,

$$|A_i| \le \frac{6}{f(\eta)^{1/4}} + \frac{36}{f(\eta)^{1/2}} + 72f(\eta)^{\frac{1}{4}}|A_0| + 36\sum_{j=1}^{k+1} |A_j| f(\eta)^{1/2} + 3\sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \ne i}}^{k+1} |A_j| f(\eta)^{3/4}. \tag{67}$$

We claim that (64) and (67) imply that $\max\{|A_i| \colon\ 0 \le i \le k+1\} \le 1/f(\eta)$ which finishes the proof. Indeed, if $\max\{|A_i| \colon\ 0 \le i \le k+1\} = |A_0|$ then (64) implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
|A_0| &\le \frac{4}{f(\eta)^{1/4}} + 8f(\eta)^{1/2}|A_0| + 4(k+1)|A_0| f(\eta)^{3/4} \\
&\le \frac{4}{f(\eta)^{1/4}} + \frac{1}{3}|A_0| + \frac{1}{3}|A_0| \quad \left(\text{since } f(\eta) < \left(\frac{1}{24}\right)^2 \wedge \left(\frac{1}{12(k+1)}\right)^{\frac{4}{3}} \text{ by (49)}\right)
\end{aligned}$$

thus

$$|A_0| \le \frac{12}{f(\eta)^{1/4}} < \frac{1}{f(\eta)} \qquad \left(\text{since } f(\eta) < \left(\frac{1}{12}\right)^{4/3} \text{ by(49)}\right). \tag{68}$$

Similarly, if there exists $\ell \in \{1, \dots, k+1\}$ such that $\max\{|A_i|\colon\ 0 \le i \le k+1\} = |A_\ell|$ then (67) for $i = \ell$ implies that

$$\begin{aligned} |A_\ell| &\le \frac{6}{f(\eta)^{1/4}} + \frac{36}{f(\eta)^{1/2}} + 72 f(\eta)^{\frac{1}{4}} |A_\ell| + 36(k+1) f(\eta)^{1/2} |A_\ell| + 3k f(\eta)^{3/4} |A_\ell| \\ &\le \frac{42}{f(\eta)^{1/2}} + \frac{1}{4}|A_\ell| + \frac{1}{4}|A_\ell| + \frac{1}{4}|A_\ell| \end{aligned}$$

(since $1/f(\eta)^{1/4} \le 1/f(\eta)^{1/2}$ and $f(\eta) < \frac{1}{288^4} \wedge \left(\frac{1}{144(k+1)}\right)^2$ by (49)). Hence

$$|A_\ell| \le \frac{168}{f(\eta)^{1/2}} \le \frac{1}{f(\eta)} \qquad \left(\text{since } f(\eta) < \frac{1}{168^2} \text{ by (49)}\right). \tag{69}$$

By (68) and (69) we have that $\max\{|A_i|\colon\ 0 \le i \le k+1\} \le 1/f(\eta)$ which finishes the proof. $\square$

References

[1] Androulakis, G.; Schlumprecht, Th. *Strictly singular non-compact operators exist on the space of Gowers-Maurey,* J. London Math. Soc. (2) **64** (2001), 1-20.

[2] Androulakis, G.; Odell, E.; Schlumprecht, Th.; Tomczak-Jaegermann, N. *On the structure of the spreading models of a Banach space*, preprint.

[3] Aronszajn, N.; Smith, K. T. *Invariant subspaces of completely continuous operators*, Ann. of Math. (2) **60**, (1954). 345–350.

[4] Enflo, P. *On the invariant subspace problem in Banach spaces.* Seminaire Maurey–Schwartz (1975–1976) Espaces L_p, applications radonifiantes et geometrie des espaces de Banach, Exp. Nos. 14-15, 7 pp. Centre Math., cole Polytech., Palaiseau, 1976.

[5] Enflo, P. *On the invariant subspace problem for Banach spaces.* Acta Math. **158** (1987), no. 3-4, 213–313.

[6] Ferenczi, V. *A uniformly convex hereditarily indecomposable Banach space.* Israel J. Math. **102** (1997), 199–225.

[7] Gasparis, I. *Strictly singular non-compact operators on hereditarily indecomposable Banach spaces*, preprint.

[8] Gowers, W. T.; Maurey, B. *The unconditional basic sequence problem.* J. Amer. Math. Soc. **6** (1993), no. 4, 851–874.

[9] Gowers, W.T. *A remark about the scalar-plus-compact problem.* Convex geometric analysis (Berkeley, CA, 1996), 111–115, Math. Sci. Res. Inst. Publ., 34, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1999.

[10] Lomonosov, V.I. *Invariant subspaces of the family of operators that commute with a completely continuous operator.* (Russian) Funkcional. Anal. i Priložen. **7** (1973), no. 3, 55–56.

[11] Read, C.J. *A solution to the invariant subspace problem.* Bull. London Math. Soc. **16** (1984), no. 4, 337–401.

[12] Read, C.J. *A solution to the invariant subspace problem on the space ℓ_1*. Bull. London Math. Soc. **17** (1985), no. 4, 305–317.

[13] Read, C.J. *A short proof concerning the invariant subspace problem.* J. London Math. Soc. (2) **34** (1986), no. 2, 335–348.

[14] Read, C.J. *Strictly singular operators and the invariant subspace problem.* Studia Math. **132** (1999), no. 3, 203–226.

Department of Mathematics, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC 29208. giorgis@math.sc.edu
Department of Mathematics, Kent State University, Kent, OH 44240. enflo@mcs.kent.edu